



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/637,302 | 08/11/2000 | John Hood | TSRI 710.2 | 8590 |

7590 12/08/2004
Olson & Hierl LTD
20 North Wacker Drive
36th Floor
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

SLOBODYANSKY, ELIZABETH

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1652

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/637,302

Applicant(s)

HOOD ET AL.

Examiner

Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD

Art Unit

1652

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,5,6,14 and 15.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____



Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1652

Continuation of 2. NOTE: claim 1 is amended to recite "at about 0.1 weight percent". This amendment changes the scope of the claim because the range of "about 0.1 weight percent" is different in scope from the range of "at least 0.1%". Further, it appears that the specification has support for "at least 0.1 weight percent" (page 36, line 1) and does not have support for "about 0.1 weight percent". The claims would require further consideration and possibly new rejections. It is noted that in claim 2 "active" is not deleted.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In essence, Applicants repeat their arguments filed with the previous amendment of 5/21/04. These arguments were responded to in the Office action mailed 8/5/04. It appears that the main point of Applicants' arguments is that "while the compounds per se may have been known, their inclusion in the packaged composition and in the specified amounts together with a label, as an article of manufacture, was not known, and is not taught or suggested" (Remarks, page 7). The disagreement between Applicants and the examiner is that the examiner considers the content of said article of manufacture as being suggested by the prior art and the label thereon as not changing said content. As in *Ngai*, a label added to a product that is obvious in view of the prior art does not interrelate with the product and thus does not impart the patentability on an article of manufacture.